

drawings of things. It is certainly unconventional to require that physically depicted objects be labeled. The prevailing practice in the patent world is to use numbers on such items. It is not clear how one would attach descriptive labels to such objects. Therefore, if the Examiner intends to persist in this objection, it is respectfully requested that some additional explanation be cited and some authority for the requirement be provided.

In further explanation, 194 is a depiction of a set-top box that sits on top of a conventional television display 134. 200 is the display screen of the television 134. 196 is the wireless interface for the set top box. In other words, all of these items are shown as they actually exist and are not depicted as blocks.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 3 calls for the graphical user interface and the voice user interface to communicate such that the focus of one of the interfaces is communicated to the other. The rejection seems to suggest that Schein uses both graphical and voice interfaces. But nothing in Schein indicates any communication between the two so that focus of one can be communicated to the other. This avoids interference between the two different interfaces. Therefore, claim 3 patentably distinguishes over the art of record.

Claim 5 calls for a module to implement conversational speech that produces a select variable and a where variable from a query received from a user. No such production of select and where variables is anywhere suggested in any of the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 5 is respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 6, no use of historical information is anywhere suggested in any of the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 6, 7, and 8 is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 calls for the conversation module to parse and store time attributes in a request. There is no suggestion in any of the cited references of parsing and storing time attributes of a request. Therefore, claim 9 and claim 10 should be in condition for allowance.

Claim 11 calls for subtracting the output of a speaker from the output of the microphone to reduce interference between the audio portion of a television program and a spoken request. No such subtraction is anywhere suggested in any of the cited references. The cited portion of the Schein reference in column 5 has nothing to do with avoiding the effect of the television

program audio in complicating speech recognition. All Schein talks about is adjusting a range of the voice so that it will not be necessary to perform unnecessary speech recognition on noises. That in no way suggests a television system that subtracts out the output audio from the television system to avoid mistaken speech recognition. Therefore, claim 11 patentably distinguishes over the art of record. In fact, it is clear that no one has even recognized the problem addressed in claim 11.

Under a similar analysis, the corresponding claims dependent on claims 14 and 23 should be in condition for allowance.

In order to simplify the prosecution of the present application, dependent claims have not yet been amended to place them in independent form. It is hoped that this will facilitate orderly prosecution of the case since it will be unnecessary for the Examiner and the Applicant to deal with renumbering of claims. At such time as agreement may be reached with respect to the allowable of appropriate dependent claims, those claims may then be converted into independent form. If the Examiner feels that this practice is inappropriate, the Applicant's attorney would appreciate a phone call so that an appropriate supplemental response may be prepared.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 4, 2002



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

APPENDIX

IN THE DRAWINGS

Proposed changes to the drawings are marked on the copies of the drawings in red.

IN THE CLAIMS

Please amend claim 9 as follows:

9 (Amended). The system of claim [1] 2 wherein said module parses and stores time attributes in a request.




FIG. 1




FIG. 2




FIG. 3




FIG. 4

